

Application No: 10/532,621  
Amendment B  
Reply to Office Action Dated 09/27/2006

Attorney Docket No: 3926.155

### REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claim 6 has been amended.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of an informality. Appropriate correction has been made. The Examiner is, therefore, requested to withdraw this objection.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parkyn, Jr. (US 6,273,596 B1).

The Examiner has stated in "Response to Arguments" on page 5 of the final Office action that Fig. 9a of Parkyn, Jr. is a cross section and in Fig. 9a the cross section of the light entry opening 884 is shown as an elongate, essential rectangular form, therefore meeting the limitations of the claim. The Examiner has further stated that the assertion of Figs. 9 and 9a being "rotation-symmetric" does not change the fact that the cross section of the light entry opening 884 is an elongate, essential rectangular form.

First, it is noted that the Examiner used the reference number 884 to refer to both the semiconductor light source and the light entry opening. However, the semiconductor light source is not the same as the light entry opening; rather, the light source is positioned in the light entry opening, as can be seen in Fig. 10 of the instant application (the light source 60 is positioned at the light entry area F).

Second, since the light entry area F is located at the bottom of the optical element, a cross section as the one shown in Fig. 9a of Parkyn, Jr. would not reveal the form of the light entry area F. Rather, only a bottom view or a horizontal cross section at the bottom part of the optical

Application No: 10/532,621  
Amendment B  
Reply to Office Action Dated 09/27/2006

Attorney Docket No: 3926.155

element can reveal the form of the light entry area. It can be rather clearly seen from Fig. 9 of Parkyn, Jr that the light entry area 960 (at the bottom of the lens 900) would have a circular form.

Third, the fact that the lens 900 is "rotation-symmetric" shows that it is impossible for the lens to have a light entry area with an elongate, essential rectangular form.

Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over Parkyn and since claims 2-5 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkyn in view of Okuchi (US 5,772,306). Claims 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkyn in view of Jenkins et al. (US 6,099,156).

The dependent claims 6-13 are believed to be patentable based on their dependency on claim 1 which is believed to be patentable as discussed above.

Favorable consideration and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. Should further issues remain prior to allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Yonghong Chen (Registration No. 56,150)  
Customer No. 30448  
Akerman Senterfitt  
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: 561-653-5000  
Fax: 561-659-6313

Date: November 20, 2006